

UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT
SOUTHERN DISTRICT OF INDIANA
INDIANAPOLIS DIVISION

| | | |
|----------------------------|---|---------------------------|
| CRAIG ANDREW MOSIER, |) | |
| |) | |
| Plaintiff, |) | |
| |) | |
| v. |) | No. 1:20-cv-02777-JPH-MPB |
| |) | |
| DOUG TATE Judge, |) | |
| JEREMY A. PEELLE Attorney, |) | |
| |) | |
| Defendants. |) | |

ORDER DISMISSING CASE

On November 12, 2020, the Court screened Plaintiff Craig Mosier's complaint and dismissed it for failure to state a plausible claim. Dkt. 7. The Court gave Mr. Mosier through December 11, 2020 to file an amended complaint. *Id.* at 3. Mr. Mosier has filed an amended complaint, dkt. 8, but the amended complaint also does not state a plausible claim. Mr. Mosier's amended complaint alleges that Judge Tate and Mr. Peelle "violated many of [his] rights by way of not honoring HJR 192." *Id.* at 5. The amended complaint provides no facts in support and does not identify any specific federal statute, federal treaty, or provision of the United States Constitution that is at issue.¹ The amended complaint therefore does not "state a claim to relief that is plausible on its face." *Ashcroft v. Iqbal*, 556 U.S. 662, 678 (2009) (quoting *Bell Atl. Corp. v. Twombly*, 550 U.S. 544, 570 (2007)).

¹ The amended complaint alleges violations of Title 18 of the United States Code. Dkt. 7 at 2. These are criminal statutes which do not give Mr. Mosier a cause of action in this Court.

Mr. Mosier's claims are therefore **DISMISSED with prejudice**. *See Paul v. Marberry*, 658 F.3d 702, 704–05 (7th Cir. 2011). Final judgment will issue by separate entry.

SO ORDERED.

Date: 1/15/2021



James Patrick Hanlon
United States District Judge
Southern District of Indiana

Distribution:

CRAIG ANDREW MOSIER
1605 S. Main St.
Kokomo, IN 46902

Terry Wayne Tolliver
BRATTAIN MINNIX GARCIA
Terry@BMGIndy.com